

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. In this Amendment, claims 1, 8 and 14 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections in view of the following remarks.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,477,570 (hereinafter "Takayama"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

One aspect of the invention relates to a program, a method, and a device for monitoring a job. According to exemplary embodiments of the present invention, a user is capable of knowing the fact that a job cannot be executed by the job processing device under the designated processing condition prior to the transmission of the job to the job processing device. The user can choose either to instruct to transfer the job nonetheless or to change the processing condition. Consequently, it is possible to avoid problems, such as transferring a job against, and executing a wasteful processing of a job that the user does not want. Applicant notes that the present invention is limited to the exemplary embodiments of the present invention.

Claim 1 recites a computer readable medium storing a computer program for causing a computer in a job transmitting device to execute a process, wherein if it is judged that said job cannot be processed in step 3), accepting at least one of a user's instruction to change the processing condition and a user's instruction to

compulsorily execute the job according to the processing condition before transmitting said job to the job processing device, and wherein the input of the processing condition for the job is accepted through a setup screen which is provided by a computer program for transmitting the job to the job processing device, and the user's instruction to change the processing condition in step 4) is also accepted through the setup screen.

The combination according to claim 1, which includes at least the above-recited features, is not taught or suggested in Takayama. In Takayama, when it is determined that a designated apparatus is unable to perform the processing specified in the job, the designated apparatus determines whether another apparatus can perform the processing. See step S160 in FIG. 15. If there is an optimal apparatus other than the designated apparatus that has capabilities consonant with the object of the job, the designated apparatus sends a job execution instruction to the apparatus having capabilities consonant with the object of the job, and notifies a user that another apparatus has executed the job. See steps S161-S163 in FIG. 15. If there is no apparatus having capabilities consonant with the object of the job, the designated apparatus provides options to the user to make any needed adjustments to the printer. See step S164 in FIG. 15. FIG. 17 of Takayama illustrates presenting options to the user to recover the disabled apparatuses to a printing enabled state. For example, when either the printer 104, which is out of toner, or the printer 103, which is out of paper, is to be recovered to the printing enabled state, the interrogation window, which displays "printing cannot be effected by any printer which you can use change toner of printer 104 or feed paper of printer 103," is presented to the user.

If there is an available alternative apparatus, Takayama discloses choosing an apparatus other than the designated apparatus, and provides notification to the user that the other apparatus has executed job. If there is not an available alternative apparatus, Takayama discloses proposing options to the user to recover disabled apparatus to printing enabled state, as described above.

Takayama does not teach or suggest that the designated apparatus executes a process that includes accepting the user's instruction to change the processing condition or compulsorily executing the job if it is judged that the job processing is not executable.

Furthermore, Takayama does not teach or suggest that the designated apparatus executes a process that includes accepting the user's instruction to change the processing condition through the setup screen where the input of the processing condition for the job is accepted.

The Examiner relies upon FIG. 17 of Takayama as allegedly disclosing accepting the user's instruction to change the processing condition or compulsorily executing the job. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As explained above, FIG. 17 of Takayama merely discloses presenting proposed method to recover the disabled apparatuses to a printing enabled state. In Takayama, the proposed method as illustrated in FIG. 7 merely presents to the user a method to enable the presently disabled apparatus so that the user may take measure to remedy the situation, e.g., changing toner or adding paper. Such proposed method cannot be considered as changing the processing condition, or as

a user's instruction to compulsorily execute the job according to the processing condition.

Therefore, Takayama fails to teach or suggest a computer readable medium storing a computer program for causing a computer in a job transmitting device to execute a process, wherein if it is judged that said job cannot be processed in step 3), accepting at least one of a user's instruction to change the processing condition and a user's instruction to compulsorily execute the job according to the processing condition before transmitting said job to the job processing device, and wherein the input of the processing condition for the job is accepted through a setup screen which is provided by a computer program for transmitting the job to the job processing device, and the user's instruction to change the processing condition in step 4) is also accepted through the setup screen, as described in claim 1.

At least for the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentable. Claims 8 and 14 are patentable because they include distinctive features analogous to these of claim 1. The remaining claims are patentable at least because of their dependencies.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested and such action is earnestly solicited.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned so that prosecution of present application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: July 16, 2009

By: Weiwei Y. Stiltner
Weiwei Y. Stiltner
Registration No. 62979

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620